



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES

The Immigration Problem. By J. W. JENKS and W. J. LAUCK.
New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1912. 8vo, pp. xxvi+496.
\$1.75.

The authors of this book, both of whom "were associated with the United States Immigration Commission from the beginning," have attempted the praiseworthy task of "putting into shape for the public in such a manner that its significance may be readily understood by any thoughtful reader, the gist of the information collected in the forty-two" bulky volumes of that commission, a few of which have already been published.

The customary phases of the immigration problem have been discussed by the authors, the more important subjects touched upon being the causes of immigration, immigrant institutions, the part played by the immigrant in the past and present development of American industries, living conditions and congestion, agencies of protection, distribution and assimilation, and oriental immigration. A separate chapter is devoted to a brief history of immigrant legislation and its administration. The concluding chapter outlines the remedies proposed by the Immigration Commission and discusses them at some length. The general direction of these recommendations is toward the enactment of measures which will tend to restrict and materially improve the character of the incoming races. An appendix of more than a hundred pages contains a large number of statistical tables and a statement of the proposed legislation.

The book has been based almost entirely, not upon the above-mentioned forty-two volumes, but upon a series of excellent abstracts of those volumes prepared by experts of the commission and published by the government as Vols. I and II of the Immigration Commission's *Reports*. The authors acknowledge in the preface that "free use has been made of the data of the commission and of the special reports of its experts," but one is led to question whether or not this brief statement is sufficient to pardon them for having lifted, in numerous instances, sentences, paragraphs, and even pages from those *Abstracts* without the change of a word or figure, without the use of quotation marks, and without any reference being made to any of the abstracts, or, with two excep-

tions, to any of the experts who prepared either the *Reports* or the *Abstracts*. The reviewer recognizes that the authors either prepared or supervised the preparation of some of the *Reports* and *Abstracts*, and he grants the right of any author to exploit his own published writings, but he questions the propriety of appropriating, without proper acknowledgments, the writings of others that appear in governmental documents. Possibly even more disappointing are the numerous errors of statement, statistics, and interpretation which have crept into the volume as the result of haste and carelessness in transcribing the data of the commission, in proofreading, and in publishing. It is possible in this short review to point out only a few of the discrepancies which have been noted. No effort has been made to choose typical cases. The references given are to the pages of the first two volumes of Immigration Commission's *Reports* (the *Abstracts*).

Statistical errors.—On p. 24 it is stated that "from 1883 to 1907, 81 per cent of the total number of European immigrants came" from southern and eastern Europe. This is not true. It should read "81 per cent came in 1907" (I, 166. See also table on p. 25 of the book itself). Although on p. 33 the total percentage of illiterate immigrants is given as 26.6, in the table on p. 34 it is placed at 38.3. The latter percentage has been obtained by the unique method of adding together the percentages of illiterates among those of "the old immigration" (2.7) and among those of "the new immigration" (35.6). The number of persons investigated seeking charity "on account of old age" is given on p. 50, lines 11-12, as 16.2 per cent of the total number. It should be 6.2 per cent (II, 116). On p. 55 the number of native-born offenders committing acts of personal violence among Massachusetts prisoners is placed at 637. It should be 657 (II, 176). On p. 56 the "Grand Total" of convictions for offenses of personal violence is placed at 1,278. It should be 1,728 (II, 194). The statements of the authors on p. 78, ll. 33-34, and on p. 79, ll. 1-4, concerning the Norwegians in agriculture should refer instead to the Swedes (I, 548-49). On p. 79, l. 7, it is stated that among the Danes in 1900, "105,749 males [were] engaged in agricultural pursuits." This number really refers instead to those engaged in all gainful occupations (I, 549). On p. 121 the authors declare that "among the natives studied 10.2 per cent of the families kept boarders." This percentage is not for natives, but for native-born of foreign father (I, 748. See table in this book, p. 432). On p. 130, ll. 15-16, the following statement appears: "The Bulgarians had as a rule more than twelve boarders or lodgers in each household." This cannot be true. P. 429 of Vol. I of the *Abstracts* and the tables on pp. 421-23 of this book itself

show that the average number of persons per household for the Bulgarians was only 6.19 and that but 14.4 per cent of their households had ten or more persons. On p. 131, l. 1, it is stated that "one-third of the Bulgarian households were living in two rooms" (it should be one room) "and two-fifths in three rooms" (it should be two rooms) (I, 427). On p. 122, l. 20, the average rent per person in New York should be \$2.79 instead of \$2.59 (I, 758). On p. 125, l. 10, 56.6 per cent of the native-born are rated as having their apartments in "good" order. It should be 50.6 per cent (I, 755). On p. 131, l. 6, "587 persons for each 100 apartments" should read "581" (I, 431), and in ll. 9-10 of the same page the statement "the native American households had only 362 persons for each 100 apartments" should read "415 per 100 apartments." The figure 362 refers to the native Negro population (I, 430). In the table on p. 280 the number of families with foreign-born head owning their homes should be 3,346 instead of 3,306 (I, 468). On p. 287, l. 26, the percentage 60.7 should be 50.7 (II, 41).

Errors of interpretation.—On p. 53, ll. 10-11, "the county and supreme courts of New York state" becomes "the Supreme Court of New York City," while on p. 54, l. 13, it becomes "the Supreme Court of the City and County of New York." On p. 54 appears the statement "the largest percentage of disease treated among the Italians is 17.3 per cent for traumatism, burns, etc., these apparently arising from the fact that the newly arrived Italian immigrant is likely to be employed in unskilled labor where he meets with slight accidents." Yet strange to say the percentage of 17.3 is for the "native-born of Italian father" (II, 278). P. 207, l. 11, bears the statement that "wages have not advanced" where "those from southeastern Europe and from Mexico" are employed. P. 646 of Vol. I of the *Abstracts* states that there has been a slight increase in the wages of these immigrants. P. 207, ll. 16-17, give wage statistics for "the maintenance of way and for construction on the railways." It should read "street railways" (I, 646). P. 233, ll. 14-15, state that "probably 10,000 or 11,000 more [Japanese] are engaged in independent business for themselves." The authors neglected to "abstract" the remainder of the sentence which reads "or are employed by those who are thus occupied, or are professional men and craftsmen working on their own account" (I, 672).

Errors in section, chapter, and table headings.—P. 93 has the following sectional heading: "Farm-Hands and Canning-Factory Operatives in the United States." The data which follow refer only to conditions in western New York. Section L of Appendix C is headed "Weekly Earnings of Industrial Workers According to Race and Ages," yet four

of the eight tables (pp. 455-60) give statistics of "Daily Earnings." The table on p. 455 is headed "Average Amount of Weekly Earnings of Female Employees 18 Years of Age or Over." It should read "14 and Under 18 Years of Age" (I, 370). The table on p. 459 is headed "Average Amount of Daily Earnings of Female Employees 14 and Under 18 Years of Age." It should read "Male Employees" (I, 373). The table on p. 465 is headed "Section O. A Summary of Immigration, 1901-1909. Immigrants Entering Continental United States during the Years 1901-1909 Inclusive by Race." That the title is misleading is realized when one notes that the table was compiled for the purpose of showing, as do two of its three columns of figures, the number and percentage of immigrants giving the western division as their destination.

Errors in tables.—On p. 55 the authors have omitted the statistics for the last two columns of the table giving the percentages for "unclassified offenses." These figures can be found on p. 176 of Vol. II of the *Abstracts*. Although the data for the "Native-born of Native Negro Father" are omitted from the tables on pp. 143-44, the totals are the same as though the data had been included (I, 377-78). The "Grand Total" in the table on p. 159 appears in the middle rather than at the foot of the table. The latter portion of the table on p. 448 is missing as is also the first part of the table on p. 449. The remainder of these tables may be found on pp. 389 and 392 respectively of Vol. I of the *Abstracts*.

Some strange statements appear at various places in the book. For example, on p. 58 we find the following: "The relative fecundity of American women as compared with the descendants of immigrants and of Americans is of great importance." On p. 77 we have the following: "The Germans have shown a tendency to assimilate readily with persons of native birth and with the older races from Great Britain." It should read "northern Europe" (I, 548). On p. 208, l. 31, and on p. 224, l. 26, we read of "oil mining," presumably meant to be "ore mining." P. 225, ll. 24-25, contains the interesting statement that "the first employment of the Japanese in a good many cases has caused breaks in strikes." "Native Americans," "American households," and "native-born" are frequently used in such a manner that the reader is uncertain whether or not the terms are meant to include the native Negro.

The book will prove to be a great disappointment to the student of the immigration problem. It contains nothing that is not found in the *Reports* and *Abstracts* of the Immigration Commission, while much that it does contain is surprisingly inaccurate. None of the numerous books, pamphlets, or magazine articles bearing upon this subject is either commented on or referred to. The authors have not attempted to analyze

anew any of the data gathered by the Commission, and consequently have accepted its conclusions *verbatim*. It is because of these things that the book cannot be considered a contribution to the discussion of the question of immigration: the work of the Immigration Commission forms the contribution in this case, but the writer is not herein reviewing its *Reports*. A partial reprint, digest, or condensation must be judged solely on the basis of accuracy. It is this which has necessitated the proof-reading character of the foregoing review.

IRA B. CROSS

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

NOTE

I am greatly indebted to Professor Cross for sending me a copy of his painstaking notes on *The Immigration Problem*.

Any such volume as this, if it is to do its work, should of course be published as promptly as possible. The authors, knowing that considerable time must elapse before the Commission's reports could be published, thought it desirable to use the earliest information that was available. They used, therefore, the first published pamphlet abstracts of the reports, which were afterward gathered into the two summary volumes. These pamphlet abstracts, though preliminary, had been read in proof and were presumably in good form. Later, however, when they were gathered into the summary volumes it was thought best by the Commission to verify once more the data which they contained. In this verification a large number of errors were found which were corrected in the volumes as published. Practically all of the mistakes found in the tables in *The Immigration Problem* are accounted for in this way. Note, for example, the tables on pp. 25 and 34. As a large proportion of the figures in the text were taken from tables, some of those errors are from this source, although doubtless others came in transcription or dictation.

Owing to the fact that for several months before the publication of the volume the authors were unable to meet and compare notes, a misunderstanding arose, so that a considerable portion of the book was not verified in the proofreading as the authors supposed had been done. Naturally, under those circumstances, other errors were not eliminated.

While I freely admit that even under these circumstances the number of proofreading errors in the early edition was altogether too large, some of the matters to which attention is called by Professor Cross are, in my opinion, matters of taste in printing; others are matters of judgment regarding the degree and type of condensation that is desir-